

REMARKS

Claim 13 was previously cancelled. With this amendment, claims 14-18 are cancelled, without prejudice, as being directed toward a previously non-elected invention. Claim 2 is amended. No new subject matter is added. Claims 1-12 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is requested in light of the following remarks.

Elections/Restrictions

The applicant affirms the election of claims 1-12 for further prosecution.

In the Claims

Claim 2 has been amended to remove the unnecessary repetition of the word “for.”

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-6 and 11-12 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

At this time, the applicant wishes to retain claims 5-6 and 11-12 in their present form so that the comments below may be fully considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant admission of prior art (AAPA) in view of US Patent Application Publication 2002/0039325 to Aizawa (“Aizawa”). The applicant disagrees.

Regarding claim 1, none of the prior art references teach an interface unit configured for first and second interface modes, as recited in the claim. To the contrary, the AAPA teaches that the flash controller communicates with the system controller and the flash memory using a single interface mode; hence the need for the emulation means described on page 2, lines 1 and 2. Aizawa makes no mention of what interface means are used to interface the MPU and the memory core. Consequently, the combination of AAPA and Aizawa fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claim 1 because it does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in the claim. MPEP 2143.03.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1, and inherently contains the features of claim 1. Consequently, claim 7 is allowable over the combination of AAPA and Aizawa at least because any claim that depends from a nonobvious independent claim is also nonobvious. MPEP 2143.03.

Further regarding claim 7, the office action proposes that the memory interface of Aizawa includes a first interface unit and a second interface unit. Aizawa does not teach that the memory interface includes a first and second interface unit. Furthermore, as mentioned above, Aizawa does not teach first and second interface modes, so there is no suggestion in Aizawa that the memory interface unit includes a first and second interface unit. The office action correctly points out that Aizawa does not teach that the flash memory is NAND flash memory, which provides further indication that Aizawa does not suggest a first and second interface unit. For this additional reason, the combination of AAPA and Aizawa fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for claim 7 because it does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in the claim. MPEP 2143.03.

Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Aizawa and further in view of US Patent 6,098,077 to Sassa (“Sassa”). The applicant disagrees.

Claims 2 and 8 depend from claim 1, and inherently contain the features of claim 1. Consequently, claims 2 and 8 are allowable over the combination of AAPA, Aizawa, and Sassa at least because any claim that depends from a nonobvious independent claim is also nonobvious. MPEP 2143.03.

Further regarding claim 2, the office action proposes that “Sassa teaches a system wherein the interface unit (21 in Fig 2) comprises...a NAND flash interface unit (21)...” However, Sassa does not teach a NAND flash interface unit as recited in the claim because it can’t teach that an element *comprises* another element and simultaneously *is* that other element. For this additional reason claim 2 is allowable over the combination of the indicated references because it does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in the claim. MPEP 2143.03.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Aizawa, further in view of Sassa, and further in view of US Patent 6,601,167 to Gibson, et al. ("Gibson"). The applicant disagrees.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1, and inherently contain the features of claim 1. Consequently, claims 3 and 4 are allowable over the combination of AAPA, Aizawa, Sassa, and Gibson at least because any claim that depends from a nonobvious independent claim is also nonobvious. MPEP 2143.03.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Aizawa, and further in view of Gibson. The applicant disagrees.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 1, and inherently contain the features of claim 1. Consequently, claims 9 and 10 are allowable over the combination of AAPA, Aizawa, and Gibson at least because any claim that depends from a nonobvious independent claim is also nonobvious. MPEP 2143.03.

Conclusion

For the reasons presented above, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is requested. Please telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Hosoon Lee
Reg. No. 56,737

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575